

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-26, 28-34 were presented for examination. By the aforementioned Final Office Action, all claims were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dorinski (US 5,001,038). By this response, Claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 33 and 34 have been amended to more particularly and distinctly point out Applicant's invention. Support for the amendment is found on Page 8, line 27 to Page 9, line 37; and Figures 1 and 3 of the specification. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-4, 6-26 and 28-34 are therefore still pending. Given the reasons set forth below, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §102

In the final action, Dorinski, in figure 6, is cited as disclosing a transparent substrate with pattern portions positioned on the transparent substrate such that the pattern portions are overlapping.

The amended Claim 1, however, recites "the first pattern portion has at least one stripe and the second pattern portion has a corresponding at least one stripe, wherein the stripes at least partly overlap when the first and second pattern portions are exposed for forming at least one trace on the surface".

Applicant respectfully submits that figure 6 of Dorinski only discloses that the patterns, as a whole, overlap as pointed out by the Examiner. The cited passage in Dorinski (col. 5, line 61 to col. 6, line 14) merely discloses that the exposed patterns on the substrate are complementary. It is further disclosed in Dorinski that "the first image 502A forms the lower half of the printed circuit pattern on the projection surface, while the second image 504A forms the upper half" (col. 6, lines 9 to 12). To be useful, the stripes or traces of the first image in Dorinski need to merely abut corresponding stripes or traces of the second image. Dorinski is completely silent regarding overlapping of stripes of respective images or patterns.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Dorinski does not disclose, teach or suggest that each of the pattern includes at least one stripe that at least partly overlaps a corresponding at least one stripe of another pattern when the two patterns are exposed for forming at least one trace as recited in the amended Claim 1. In other words, the patterns according to the teachings of Dorinski overlap only at a macro level, i.e. as far as the whole pattern portions are concerned, but not at a micro level, i.e. at the level of individual stripes of the pattern portions.

Once again, Applicant respectfully submits that for anticipation under §102, there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. The anticipation requires identity in the claimed elements. Such is not the case between the subject matter of Applicant's amended Claim 1 and the teachings of Dorinski as discussed above.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention according to the amended Claim 1, and thus Claims 8, 20, 33 and 34, which are amended to also include the abovementioned feature, is clearly distinguished from what is disclosed by Dorinski, and thus, is allowable under 35 U.S.C §102.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9-19, 21-26 and 28-32 are also allowable in that they variously depend from one of Claims 1, 8, and 20.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the grounds for the Examiner's rejections have been overcome and Claims 1-4, 6-26 and 28-34 should be found to be in condition for allowance.

Date: January 21, 2004

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Mail Stop 35

Respectfully submitted,

Name: 

Wendell J. Jones

Reg. No.: 45,961

Telephone No: (650) 857-7453

BEST AVAILABLE COPY